

EXACT MATCHING CONDITION FOR MATRIX ELEMENTS IN LATTICE AND $\overline{\text{MS}}$ SCHEMES *

Xiangdong Ji
*Center for Theoretical Physics
 Laboratory for Nuclear Science
 and Department of Physics
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology
 Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139*

(MIT-CTP-2447

hep-lat/xxxxxxx

June 1995)

Abstract

The exact matching condition is given for hadron matrix elements calculated in any two different schemes, in particular, in the lattice and dimensional regularization, (modified) minimal subtraction $\overline{\text{MS}}$ schemes. The result provides insight into and permits to go beyond Lepage and Mackenzie's mean field theory of removing tadpole contributions in lattice operators.

Typeset using REV_TEX

*This work is supported in part by funds provided by the U.S. Department of Energy (D.O.E.) under cooperative agreement #DF-FC02-94ER40818.

Presently, lattice QCD provides the unique method with controlled approximation to compute hadron properties directly from the QCD lagrangian. In the last few years, a number of groups have calculated on the lattice an impressive list of hadron matrix elements, ranging from the axial and scalar charges of the nucleon to lower-order moments of deep-inelastic structure functions [1–3]. Note, however, that most of the hadron matrix elements are not directly physical observables. In field theory, apart from the S-matrix, physical observables are related to symmetry generators of the lagrangian, such as the vector and axial-vector currents or hadron masses. Nonetheless, hadron matrix elements are useful intermediate quantities to express physical observables. Being intermediate, they often depend on specific definitions in particular context. Or in field theory jargon, they are scheme-dependent. Since schemes are generally introduced to eliminate ultraviolet divergences in composite operators, the scheme dependence of a matrix element is in fact perturbative in asymptotically-free QCD.

Understanding scheme dependence has important practical values. In calculating hadron matrix elements on a lattice, one is automatically limited to the lattice scheme. On the other hand, hadron matrix elements entering physical cross sections are often defined in connection with perturbation theory. The best scheme for doing perturbation theory is not the lattice QCD, because the lattice has complicated Feynman rules and accommodates only Euclidean Green’s functions. The most popular scheme for perturbative calculations is the dimensional regularization introduced by t’ Hooft and Veltman more than two decades ago, followed by the (modified) minimal subtraction ($\overline{\text{MS}}$).

A popular practice currently adopted in the literature for matching the matrix elements in the lattice and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ schemes goes like this [1,4]. Consider, for instance, a quark operator O . First, the one-loop matrix element of O in a single quark state $|k\rangle$ is calculated on the lattice,

$$\langle k|O|k\rangle_{\text{latt}} = A \left(1 + \frac{g_0(a)^2}{4\pi^2} (\gamma \ln a^2 p^2 + c) \right) , \quad (1)$$

and in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme,

$$\langle k|O|k\rangle_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = A \left(1 + \frac{g(\mu)^2}{4\pi^2} (\gamma \ln p^2/\mu^2 + c') \right) , \quad (2)$$

where p^2 is an infrared cut-off. Second, the hadron matrix elements in the state $|P\rangle$ in the two schemes are assumed to have the relation,

$$\frac{\langle P|O|P\rangle_{\text{latt}}}{\langle P|O|P\rangle_{\overline{\text{MS}}}} = \frac{\langle k|O|k\rangle_{\text{latt}}}{\langle k|O|k\rangle_{\overline{\text{MS}}}} = 1 + \frac{g^2}{4\pi^2} (\gamma \ln a^2 \mu^2 + c - c') . \quad (3)$$

In the second equality, an expansion in g^2 is made. In order to cancel the infrared cutoff p^2 , one has to identify $g_0(a)$ and $g(\mu)$. However, after the cancellation, one does not know which g should be used in the above equation. Due to the large tad-pole contributions, the difference between coupling constants in the two schemes is significant in the same momentum region. Furthermore, it is not clear how to generalize the above relation to multi-loops.

As indicated early, the difference between the matrix elements in any two schemes arises from the ultraviolet region. Thus there must exist an all-order perturbative relation between the matrix elements calculated in the two schemes. In this note, I shall derive such a relation using renormalization group arguments.

Consider a physics observable $M(Q^2)$ where Q^2 is a hard momentum scale of a physical process. $M(Q^2)$ could be a moment of some deep-inelastic structure function. According to the operator-product expansion, we write,

$$M(Q^2) = C(Q^2/\mu^2, \alpha_s(\mu^2))A(\mu^2) . \quad (4)$$

where C is the coefficient function, calculable in perturbative theory. C is clearly scheme-dependent, and let us assume a scheme has been chosen for its calculation. A is a soft hadron matrix element defined in the same scheme. The μ dependence of A satisfies the renormalization group equation,

$$\frac{dA(\mu)}{d\mu} + \gamma(\mu)A(\mu) = 0 , \quad (5)$$

where γ is the anomalous dimension of the operator in the scheme. The renormalization scale dependence must cancel between C and A , leaving M μ -independent. Therefore C satisfies the renormalization group equation,

$$\frac{dC}{d\mu} - \gamma(\mu)C = 0 . \quad (6)$$

The above equation can be integrated formally to yield,

$$C(Q^2/\mu^2, \alpha_s(\mu^2)) = C(1, \alpha_s(Q^2)) \exp \left(- \int_{g(\mu)}^{g(Q^2)} \frac{\gamma}{\beta} dg \right) , \quad (7)$$

where the QCD β -function is also scheme-dependent. From the above formulas and the fact that M is scheme-independent, we derive a relation between the matrix elements in two different schemes,

$$C(1, \alpha_s(Q^2)) \exp \left(- \int_{g(\mu)}^{g(Q^2)} \frac{\gamma}{\beta} dg \right) A(\mu) = \tilde{C}(1, \tilde{\alpha}_s(Q^2)) \exp \left(- \int_{\tilde{g}(\tilde{\mu})}^{\tilde{g}(Q^2)} \frac{\tilde{\gamma}}{\tilde{\beta}} d\tilde{g} \right) \tilde{A}(\tilde{\mu}) . \quad (8)$$

It seems that one has to know the coefficient functions in the two schemes before hand. However, this is unnecessary if one takes $Q^2 \rightarrow \infty$ and uses asymptotic freedom. In the limit, the coupling constants in different schemes approach to zero at the same rate and $C(1,0)$ becomes scheme-independent! Thus we have,

$$\exp \left(- \int_{g(\mu)}^0 \frac{\gamma}{\beta} dg \right) A(\mu) = \exp \left(- \int_{\tilde{g}(\tilde{\mu})}^0 \frac{\tilde{\gamma}}{\tilde{\beta}} d\tilde{g} \right) \tilde{A}(\tilde{\mu}) . \quad (9)$$

This is the desired equation, which depends on the β -functions and anomalous dimensions of the operator in two different schemes. The matrix elements defined in this equation satisfy the renormalization group equations in both schemes.

To specialize to the lattice and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ schemes, let me make the following definitions,

$$O_B(\frac{1}{\epsilon}) = Z(\mu)O_{\overline{\text{MS}}}(\mu); \quad \gamma_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = \frac{\mu}{Z(\mu)} \frac{dZ(\mu)}{d\mu}, \quad (10)$$

where $O_B(1/\epsilon)$ and $O_{\overline{\text{MS}}}$ are the bare and renormalized operators in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme, and

$$O_{\text{latt}}(a) = Z(a)O_{\text{R latt}}; \quad \gamma_{\text{latt}} = -\frac{a}{Z(a)} \frac{dZ(a)}{da}, \quad (11)$$

where $O_{\text{latt}}(a)$ and $O_{\text{R latt}}$ are the bare and renormalized operators in the lattice scheme. Define further a renormalization relation between the bare lattice and renormalized $\overline{\text{MS}}$ operators,

$$O_{\overline{\text{MS}}}(\mu) = Z(\alpha_s(a), \alpha_s(\mu))O_{\text{latt}}(a). \quad (12)$$

Then the renormalization constant is,

$$Z(\alpha_s(a), \alpha_s(\mu)) = \exp\left(\int_0^{g(a)} \frac{\gamma_{\text{latt}}}{\beta_{\text{latt}}} dg\right) \exp\left(-\int_0^{g(\mu)} \frac{\gamma_{\overline{\text{MS}}}}{\beta_{\overline{\text{MS}}}} dg\right). \quad (13)$$

The corresponding relation between the matrix elements in the two schemes is $A_{\overline{\text{MS}}}(\mu) = Z(\alpha_s(a), \alpha_s(\mu))A_{\text{latt}}(a)$.

In practical applications, one uses a perturbative expansion of Eq. (13). To next to the leading order,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \gamma_0\left(\frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}\right) + \gamma_1\left(\frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}\right)^2 + \dots, \\ \beta &= -g\left(\beta_0\left(\frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}\right) + \beta_1\left(\frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}\right)^2 + \dots\right). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Substituting the above into Eq. (13), I find,

$$Z(\alpha_s(a), \alpha_s(\mu)) = \left(\frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{\alpha_s(a)}\right)^{\gamma_0/2\beta_0} \left(\frac{1 + (\alpha_s(\mu)/8\pi)(\frac{\gamma_1(\mu)}{\beta_0} - \frac{\gamma_0\beta_1}{\beta_0^2}) + \dots}{1 + (\alpha_s(a)/8\pi)(\frac{\gamma_1(a)}{\beta_0} - \frac{\gamma_0\beta_1}{\beta_0^2}) + \dots}\right), \quad (15)$$

where I have used the fact that the first-two-loop β functions and the one-loop anomalous dimensions are scheme-independent. γ_1 is the two-loop anomalous dimension and is scheme-dependent. The constants c and c' in Eqs. (1) and (2) do not enter in the above relation directly. However, they contribute through the two-loop anomalous dimensions.

The first factor in Eq. (15) sums over all the leading logarithmic contributions. At the momentum scales associated with current lattice calculations, the strong coupling constant in $\overline{\text{MS}}$ is nearly a factor 2 larger than the bare lattice coupling because of the large tadpole contributions. Thus if $\gamma_0/2\beta_0$ is on the order of unity, the first factor in Eq. (15) is large. However, this is not the only source of large tadpoles contributions. The lattice operators, defined using the gauge link $U_\mu = \exp(ig_0 a A_\mu)$, where A_μ is the gauge potential, also contain large tadpole effects, reflected by the large constant c in Eq. (1). This large constant induces a large two-loop anomalous dimension $\gamma_1(a)$. As a consequence, the lattice perturbation series in the denominator of Eq. (15) converges sluggishly and must be improved with some resummation procedure.

In Ref. [5], Lepage and Mackenzie suggested to replace the bare lattice coupling $\alpha_s(a)$ in a perturbative expansion by a renormalized coupling, such as the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ coupling, $\alpha_s(\mu)$. Such improvement procedure eliminates large coefficients in the expansion and speed up the convergence of the series. However, to completely cancel the tadpole contributions, one must multiply the series with an expansion of some power of $\alpha_s(a)/\alpha_s(\mu)$. The appropriate power is determined by the anomalous dimension of the operator, which in turn depends on a particular construction of the operator on the lattice. The residual factor of $\alpha_s(a)/\alpha_s(\mu)$ in Eq. (15) represents the intrinsic tadpole effect of the lattice operator, accounting for the major part of the renormalization factor. For the same continuum operator, one can construct many different versions of lattice operators, which are affected by tadpole contributions differently.

In general, the lattice two-loop anomalous dimension $\gamma_1(a)$ can give a good indication as to what power of $\alpha_s(a)$ is needed to cancel the tadpole effects in the lattice series. Lepage and Mackenzie's mean field theory provides an empirical method to determine the residual power of $\alpha_s(a)/\alpha_s(\mu)$ in the renormalization factor. Consider a lattice operator constructed with k powers of gauge links. Then, according to Lepage and Mackenzie, the tadpole effects can be accounted for by multiplying the lattice operator with a factor of u_0^{-k} . Through studying the effect on the Wilson action, Lepage and Mackenzie determined $u_0 = (\alpha_s(a)/\alpha_s(\mu))^{1/4}$. Thus, the mean field theory predicts $Z \sim (\alpha_s(a)/\alpha_s(\mu))^{-k/4}$ apart from a well-behaved perturbation series.

However, Eq. (15) allows one to go beyond the mean field theory with the explicit dependence on perturbative corrections to high orders. With more powerful methods becoming available for computing lattice perturbation series, this exact formula for the renormalization factor is quite valuable. The formula also corrects the mean field prediction when the latter fails. An extreme case is the unit operator constructed as UU^{-1} on the lattice, for which a naive application of the mean field theory fails completely.

To summarize, I have derived an exact relation between the matrix elements in lattice and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ schemes. The relation is used to discuss Lepage and Mackenzie's mean field theory for correcting the tadpole effects in lattice operators. The relation is useful for comparing the hadron matrix elements calculated in the lattice and measured, for instance, in deep-inelastic scattering.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank W. Lin, B. Schrieber, U. Wiese, and in particular, J. Negele for useful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Martinelli and C. T. Sachrajda, Phys. Lett. B196 (1987); Nucl. Phys. B306 (1988) 865; Nucl. Phys. B316 (1989) 355.
- [2] M. Gockeler, R. Horsley, M. Ilgenfritz, H. Perlt, P. Rakow, G. Schierholz, and A. Schiller, Combined talks presented by H. Perlt, P. Rakow and R. Horsley at LAT94, Bielefeld, Germany, DESY 94-227, HLRZ 94-64, FUB-HEP/94-15, HUB-IEP-94/30, December 1994.
- [3] K. F. Liu, S. J. Dong, T. Draper, J. M. Wu, and W. Wilcox, Phys. Rev. D49 (1994) 4755; K. F. Liu, Invited talk at energy research power user symposium, Rockville, Maryland, June 12, 1994.
- [4] A. S. Kronfeld and D. M. Photiadis, Phys. Rev. D31 (1985) 2939.
- [5] G. P. Lepage and P. B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. D48 (1993) 2250.